

PATTERN FORMATION (II): THE TURING INSTABILITY

YAN GUO AND HYUNG JU HWANG

ABSTRACT. We consider the classical Turing instability in a reaction-diffusion system as the second part of our study on pattern formation. We prove that nonlinear dynamics of a general perturbation of the Turing instability is determined by the finite number of linear growing modes over a time scale of $\ln \frac{1}{\delta}$, where δ is the strength of the initial perturbation.

1. GROWING MODES IN A REACTION-DIFFUSION SYSTEM

In this section we summarize the classical linear Turing instability criterion for a reaction-diffusion system. Consider a reaction-diffusion system of 2-species as

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} &= \nabla \cdot (D_1(U, V) \nabla U) + f(U, V), \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} &= \nabla \cdot (D_2(U, V) \nabla V) + g(U, V), \end{aligned}$$

where $U(\mathbf{x}, t), V(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are concentration for species, D_1, D_2 diffusion coefficients, f, g reaction terms.

In this paper we consider a d -dimensional box $\mathbb{T}^d = (0, \pi)^d$, $d = 1, 2, 3$, with Neumann boundary conditions for U and V , i.e.,

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{\partial U}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i} = 0 \quad \text{at } x_i = 0, \pi, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Homogeneous steady state $U = \bar{U}, V = \bar{V}$ forms a steady state provided

$$(1.3) \quad 0 = f(\bar{U}, \bar{V}) = g(\bar{U}, \bar{V}).$$

In this article, we study the nonlinear evolution of a perturbation

$$u(x, t) = U(x, t) - \bar{U}, \quad v(x, t) = V(x, t) - \bar{V}$$

around $[\bar{U}, \bar{V}]$, which satisfies the equivalent reaction-diffusion system:

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_1(u + \bar{U}, v + \bar{V}) \nabla u) + f(u + \bar{U}, v + \bar{V}),$$

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_2(u + \bar{U}, v + \bar{V}) \nabla v) + g(u + \bar{U}, v + \bar{V}).$$

The corresponding linearized system then takes the form

$$(1.6) \quad u_t = \bar{D}_1 \nabla^2 u + \bar{f}_u u + \bar{f}_v v,$$

$$(1.7) \quad v_t = \bar{D}_2 \nabla^2 v + \bar{g}_u u + \bar{g}_v v,$$

where $\bar{D}_1 = D_1(\bar{U}, \bar{V})$, $\bar{D}_2 = D_2(\bar{U}, \bar{V})$, $\bar{f}_u = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\bar{U}, \bar{V})$, $\bar{f}_v = \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(\bar{U}, \bar{V})$, $\bar{g}_u = \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\bar{U}, \bar{V})$, $\bar{g}_v = \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(\bar{U}, \bar{V})$.

We use $[\cdot, \cdot]$ to denote a column vector, and let

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) \equiv [u(x, t), v(x, t)], \quad \bar{\mathbf{W}} = [\bar{U}, \bar{V}].$$

Then the original nonlinear system (1.4) and (1.5) can be written in a matrix form:

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{w}}{\partial t} &= \nabla \cdot (D \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \mathbf{F} \\ &= (\bar{D} \nabla^2 \mathbf{w} + A \mathbf{w}) + (\{\nabla \cdot (D \nabla \mathbf{w}) - \bar{D} \nabla^2 \mathbf{w}\} + \mathbf{F} - A \mathbf{w}) \\ &\equiv \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \begin{pmatrix} D_1(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) & 0 \\ 0 & D_2(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{D}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{D}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{F} &= \begin{pmatrix} f(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \\ g(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{f}_u & \bar{f}_v \\ \bar{g}_u & \bar{g}_v \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_d) \in \Omega = (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^d$ and let

$$e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^d \cos(q_i x_i),$$

where $\mathbf{q} \in \Omega$. Then $\{e_{\mathbf{q}}(x)\}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega}$ forms a basis of the space of functions in $\mathbb{T}^d$ that satisfy Neumann boundary condition (1.2).

We look for a normal mode to the linear reaction-diffusion system (1.6) and (1.7) of the following form:

$$(1.9) \quad \mathbf{w}(x, t) = \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{q}} \exp(\lambda_{\mathbf{q}} t) e_{\mathbf{q}}(x),$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{q}}$ is a vector depending on $\mathbf{q}$. We substitute (1.9) into (1.6)-(1.7) to get

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{q}} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{f}_u - \bar{D}_1 q^2 & \bar{f}_v \\ \bar{g}_u & \bar{g}_v - \bar{D}_2 q^2 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{q}},$$

where $q^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d q_i^2$. A nontrivial normal mode can be obtained by setting

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{\mathbf{q}} - \bar{f}_u + \bar{D}_1 q^2 & -\bar{f}_v \\ -\bar{g}_u & \lambda_{\mathbf{q}} - \bar{g}_v + \bar{D}_2 q^2 \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

This leads to the following dispersion formula for $\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}$:

$$(1.10) \quad \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^2 + \{-\bar{f}_u + \bar{D}_1 q^2 - \bar{g}_v + \bar{D}_2 q^2\} \lambda_{\mathbf{q}} + \{(\bar{f}_u - \bar{D}_1 q^2)(\bar{g}_v - \bar{D}_2 q^2) - \bar{f}_v \bar{g}_u\} = 0.$$

We assume first that without diffusion, the $\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}$ has negative real part (stable):

$$(1.11) \quad \text{tr } A = \bar{f}_u + \bar{g}_v < 0, \quad \det A = \bar{f}_u \bar{g}_v - \bar{f}_v \bar{g}_u > 0,$$

On the other hand, in the presence of diffusion, we assume the following diffusion-driven (linear) instability criterion by requiring there exists a q such that

$$(1.12) \quad (\bar{f}_u - \bar{D}_1 q^2)(\bar{g}_v - \bar{D}_2 q^2) - \bar{f}_v \bar{g}_u < 0,$$

which ensures that (1.10) has at least one positive root $\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}$.

Remark 1. *To satisfy (1.11) and (1.12), the discriminant for the quadratic equation for q^2 in (1.12) must be positive:*

$$(1.13) \quad (\bar{f}_u \bar{D}_2 + \bar{g}_v \bar{D}_1) > 2\sqrt{\bar{D}_1 \bar{D}_2} \det A > 0,$$

which means the range of inhibition $\sqrt{\bar{D}_2/|\bar{g}_v|}$ is larger than the range of activation $\sqrt{\bar{D}_1/|\bar{f}_u|}$. From (1.11) and (1.13), it follows that

$$(1.14) \quad \bar{f}_u \bar{g}_v < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{f}_v \bar{g}_u < 0,$$

and we have only two cases for A :

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} + & - \\ + & - \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} + & + \\ - & - \end{pmatrix},$$

where formal case is called activator-inhibitor (or predator-prey) and the latter positive feedback. It also follows from (1.11) that

$$\bar{D}_1 \neq \bar{D}_2.$$

For given $\mathbf{q} \in \Omega$, we denote the corresponding eigenvalues by $\lambda_{\pm}(\mathbf{q})$ and eigenvectors by $\mathbf{r}_{\pm}(\mathbf{q})$. We split into the three cases for the linear analysis:

(1) Generic case where we have two independent real eigenvectors and we denote

$$\Omega_{\text{generic}} \equiv \{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega \text{ such that } \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) \neq \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q})\}.$$

By an elementary computation of the discriminant of (1.10), we have, except for only *finitely* many q ,

$$(\bar{D}_1 - \bar{D}_2) q^4 - \text{tr } A (\bar{D}_1 + \bar{D}_2) q^2 + 4(\bar{f}_u \bar{D}_2 + \bar{g}_v \bar{D}_1) q^2 + (\text{tr } A)^2 - 4 \det A > 0,$$

since $\bar{D}_1 - \bar{D}_2 \neq 0$. Therefore, there are two distinct real roots such that

$$\lambda_-(\mathbf{q}) < \lambda_+(\mathbf{q})$$

for large q . Since $\bar{f}_v \neq 0$ in (1.14), the corresponding (linearly independent) eigenvectors $\mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q})$ are given by

$$(1.15) \quad \mathbf{r}_\pm(\mathbf{q}) = \left[1, \frac{\lambda_\pm(\mathbf{q}) - \bar{f}_u + \bar{D}_1 q^2}{\bar{f}_v} \right].$$

It is easy to see from (1.12) that there exist only finitely many $\mathbf{q}$ such that $\lambda_+(\mathbf{q}) > 0$. We therefore can denote the largest eigenvalue by $\lambda_{\max} > 0$ and define

$$\Omega_{\max} \equiv \{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega \text{ such that } \lambda_+(\mathbf{q}) = \lambda_{\max}\}.$$

We also denote $\nu > 0$ to be the gap between the $\lambda_{\max}$ and the rest. Moreover, there is one q^2 (possibly two) having $\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^+(q^2) = \lambda_{\max}$ when we regard $\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^+$ as a function of q^2 .

(2) Defective case where we have the repeated real eigenvalues and eigenvectors:

Note that there may be possibly one q^2 (so finitely many $\mathbf{q}$) such that from (1.11)

$$(1.16) \quad \lambda_+(\mathbf{q}) = \lambda_-(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \lambda(\mathbf{q}) = \{\bar{f}_u + \bar{g}_v - (\bar{D}_1 + \bar{D}_2) q^2\}/2 < 0$$

and $\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})$ and we denote

$$\Omega_{\text{defective}} \equiv \{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega \text{ such that } \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q})\}.$$

In this case we find another independent vector

$$\mathbf{r}'(\mathbf{q}) = [0, \frac{1}{\bar{f}_v}]$$

satisfying $(A - \lambda(\mathbf{q})I) \mathbf{r}'(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})$.

(3) Complex case where we have complex eigenvalues for q and we denote it by $\Omega_{\text{complex}} \equiv \Omega - (\Omega_{\text{generic}} \cup \Omega_{\text{defective}})$. For $\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{complex}}$, we denote $\lambda_+(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \text{Re } \lambda(\mathbf{q}) + i \text{Im } \lambda(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + i \text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})$. Then we have $\lambda_-(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \text{Re } \lambda(\mathbf{q}) - i \text{Im } \lambda(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) - i \text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})$. Notice that $\text{Re } \lambda(\mathbf{q}) < 0$ as in (1.16), and $\text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})$ and $\text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})$ are linearly independent vectors.

Given any initial perturbation $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}, 0)$, we can expand it as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}, 0) &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega} \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{q}} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{generic}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}}^- \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^+ \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q})\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{defective}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w'_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}'(\mathbf{q})\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{complex}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{Re}} \text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{Im}} \text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} (1.17) \quad \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{q}} &= w_{\mathbf{q}}^- \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^+ \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{generic}}, \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{q}} &= w_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w'_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}'(\mathbf{q}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{defective}}, \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{q}} &= w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{Re}} \text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{Im}} \text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{complex}}. \end{aligned}$$

The unique solution $\mathbf{w}(x, t) = [u(x, t), v(x, t)]$ to (1.6)-(1.7) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (1.18) \quad \mathbf{w}(x, t) &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{generic}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}}^- \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}) \exp(\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^- t) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^+ \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) \exp(\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^+ t)\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{defective}}} \{(w_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w'_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}'(\mathbf{q})) + w'_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) t\} \exp(\lambda_{\mathbf{q}} t) e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{complex}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{Re}} (\text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) \cos[(\text{Im } \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}) t] - \text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) \sin[(\text{Im } \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}) t]) \\ &+ w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{Im}} (\text{Re } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) \sin[(\text{Im } \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}) t] + \text{Im } \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) \cos[(\text{Im } \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}) t])\} \exp[(\text{Re } \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}) t] e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &\equiv e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}(x, 0). \end{aligned}$$

For any $\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t) \in [L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)]^2$, we denote $\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\| \equiv \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}$. Our main result of this section is

Lemma 1. *Assume that (1.11) and the instability criterion (1.12) are valid. Suppose*

$$\mathbf{w}(x, t) = [u(x, t), v(x, t)] \equiv e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}(x, 0)$$

as in (1.18) is a solution to the linearized reaction-diffusion system (1.6)-(1.7) with initial condition $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}, 0)$. Then there exists a constant $C_1 \geq 1$ depending on $\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{D}_1, \bar{D}_2, A$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, t)\| \leq C_1 \exp(\lambda_{\max} t) \|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, 0)\|,$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. We first notice that from the quadratic formula for (1.10), for q large,

$$|\det[\mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q})]| = \frac{\lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^+ - \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^-}{|\bar{f}_v|} \geq c \frac{|\bar{D}_1 - \bar{D}_2|}{|\bar{f}_v|} q^2.$$

Thus solving (1.17) yields, due to $\bar{D}_1 \neq \bar{D}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\pm}| &\leq \frac{1}{|\det[\mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q})]|} |\mathbf{r}_{\pm}(\mathbf{q})| \times |\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{q}}| \\ &\leq C |\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{q}}|, \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_{\mathbf{q}} < 0$, for $q \in \Omega_{\text{defective}}$, we have

$$t \exp(\lambda_{\mathbf{q}} t) \leq C.$$

Moreover, recall $\operatorname{Re} \lambda(\mathbf{q}) < 0$ for $q \in \Omega_{\text{complex}}$. Thus we deduce the Lemma on the linear growth rate by the formula (1.18). $\square$

2. MAIN RESULT

Let θ be a small fixed constant, and $\lambda_{\max}$ be the dominant eigenvalue which is the maximal growth rate. We also denote the gap between the largest growth rate $\lambda_{\max}$ and the rest by $\nu > 0$. Then for $\delta > 0$ arbitrary small, we define the escape time T^δ by

$$(2.1) \quad \theta = \delta \exp(\lambda_{\max} T^\delta),$$

or equivalently

$$T^\delta = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}} \ln \frac{\theta}{\delta}.$$

Our main theorem is

Theorem 1. *Assume (1.11) and that there exists $q^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d q_i^2$ satisfying instability criterion (1.12). Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_0(x) &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega} \{w_{\mathbf{q}}^- \mathbf{r}_-(\mathbf{q}) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^+ \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q})\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{defective}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w'_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{r}'(\mathbf{q})\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\text{complex}}} \{w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\operatorname{Re}} \operatorname{Re} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q}) + w_{\mathbf{q}}^{\operatorname{Im}} \operatorname{Im} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{q})\} e_{\mathbf{q}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

$\in H^2$ such that $\|\mathbf{w}_0\| = 1$. Assume $D_1, D_2, f, g \in C^2$ near $\bar{W}$, so that there exists $\eta > 0$

(2.2)

$$C_\eta \equiv \max_{\|w\|_\infty \leq \eta} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \|D_i(\bar{W} + w)\|_{C^2} + \|f(\bar{W} + w)\|_{C^2} + \|g(\bar{W} + w)\|_{C^2} \right\} < \infty.$$

Then there exist constants $\delta_0 > 0$, $C > 0$, and $\theta > 0$, depending on $\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{D}_1, \bar{D}_2, f, g$, such that for all $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, if the initial perturbation of the steady state $[\bar{U}, \bar{V}]$ in (1.3) is

$$\mathbf{w}^\delta(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \delta \mathbf{w}_0,$$

then its nonlinear evolution $\mathbf{w}^\delta(t, x)$ satisfies

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t, x) - \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\max}} w_{\mathbf{q}}^+ \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) e_{\mathbf{q}}(x)\| \\ & \leq C \{e^{-\nu t} + \delta \|w_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t}\} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T^\delta$, and $\nu > 0$ is the gap between $\lambda_{\max}$ and the rest of $\text{Re } \lambda_{\mathbf{q}}$ in (1.10).

We notice that for $0 \leq t \leq T^\delta$, $\delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t} \leq \theta$, is sufficiently small. The initial profile $\mathbf{w}_0$ is any H^2 function. In particular, as long as $w_{\mathbf{q}_0}^+ \neq 0$ for at least one $\mathbf{q}_0 \in \Omega_{\max}$ (generic for a general H^2 perturbation), the part of its fastest growing modes satisfies

$$\|\delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\max}} w_{\mathbf{q}}^+ \mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}) e_{\mathbf{q}}\| \geq \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t} |w_{\mathbf{q}_0}^+| |\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}_0)|,$$

which has the dominant leading order of $\delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t}$. Our estimate (2.3) implies that the dynamics of a general perturbation can be characterized by such linear dynamics over a long time period of $\varepsilon T^\delta \leq t \leq T^\delta$, for any fixed constant $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, choose a fixed $\mathbf{q}_0 \in \Omega_{\max}$ and let

$$w_0(x) = \frac{\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}_0)}{|\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}_0)|} e_{\mathbf{q}_0}(x)$$

then if $t = T^\delta$,

$$\left\| \mathbf{w}^\delta(t, \cdot) - \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} T^\delta} \frac{\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}_0)}{|\mathbf{r}_+(\mathbf{q}_0)|} e_{\mathbf{q}_0}(\cdot) \right\| \leq C \{\delta^{\nu/\lambda_{\max}} + \theta^2\},$$

hence

$$\|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t, \cdot)\| \geq \theta - C \{\delta^{\nu/\lambda_{\max}} + \theta^2\} \geq \theta/2 > 0,$$

which implies nonlinear instability as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. The instability occurs before the possible blow-up time.

Reaction-diffusion systems are often employed to study chemical and biological pattern formation and have received much attention from scientists [3], [4], [14], [13], [16], since the pioneering work of Turing [17] in 1951. This symmetry breaking instability is called diffusion-driven instability, since the presence of diffusion and the difference of diffusion coefficients are essential for the instability mechanism and nonuniform pattern formation. After some experimental results such as in [2], [12], [15], more extensive and serious works began towards this Turing-like pattern formation across many fields of study. Our result can be interpreted as a mathematical description of early pattern formation. Each initial perturbation can be drastically different from another, which gives rise to the richness of the pattern; on the other hand, the finite number maximal growing modes determine the common characteristics of the pattern, over the time scale of $\ln \frac{1}{\delta}$. In comparison with an earlier *different* result along this direction [18]: First of all, the reaction-diffusion system considered here is *not* scaled. Secondly, our initial perturbation is more general, need not be close to the space of finite number of maximal growing modes. Thirdly, a precise estimate of the time scale ($\ln \frac{1}{\delta}$) for pattern formation is given here, without an *a-priori* assumption for the smallness of the perturbation later in time as in [18]. Lastly, based on Guo-Strauss' bootstrap argument, our proof is much simpler and direct.

3. BOOTSTRAP LEMMA

We state existence of local-in-time solutions for (1.4)-(1.5).

Lemma 2. (*Local existence*) For $s \geq 1$ ($d = 1$) and $s \geq 2$ ($d = 2, 3$), there exist a $T > 0$ and a constant C depending on $\bar{U}, \bar{V}, D_1, D_2, f, g$ such that $\|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{H^s}$ is continuous in $[0, T)$, and

$$\|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{H^s} \leq C \|\mathbf{w}(0)\|_{H^s}.$$

We now derive the following energy estimates for d -dimensional reaction-diffusion system with $d = 1, 2, 3$.

Lemma 3. Suppose that $[u(x, t), v(x, t)]$ is a solution to the full system (1.4)-(1.5). Then for $\|w(t)\|_{H^2} \leq \eta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{|\partial|=2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \{|\partial u|^2 + |\partial v|^2\} d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \sum_{|\partial|=2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \frac{\bar{D}_1}{2} |\nabla \partial u|^2 + \bar{D}_2 |\nabla \partial v|^2 \right\} d\mathbf{x} + \frac{|\bar{g}_v|}{2} \sum_{|\alpha|=2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial v|^2 \\ & \leq C_0 C_1 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^2} \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{w}\|^2 + C_2 \|u\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

where C_0 is the universal constant while $C_1 = C_0 C_\eta (1 + \eta)$ and

$$C_2 = \frac{\left(\frac{(\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u)^2}{2|\bar{g}_v|} + \bar{f}_u \right)^3}{\bar{D}_1^2}.$$

Proof. We first notice that the reaction-diffusion system (1.4)-(1.5) preserves the evenness of the solution $\mathbf{w}(x, t)$, i.e., if $\mathbf{w}(x, t)$ is a solution, then $\mathbf{w}(-x_i, t)$ is also a solution. We can regard the Neumann problem as a special case with evenness of the periodic problem by standard way of even extension $\mathbf{w}(x, t)$ with respect to one of the x_i . For this reason we may assume periodicity at the boundary of the extended periodic box $2\mathbb{T}^3 \equiv (-\pi, \pi)^d$. Since now there is no contributions from the boundaries, we can take second order ∂ -derivative of (1.8) to get

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial \mathbf{w}|^2 = \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \partial \mathbf{w}^T \partial \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}) + \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \partial \mathbf{w}^T \partial \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}).$$

We first treat the last nonlinear term:

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \{\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\}^T [\partial \{D(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \nabla \mathbf{w}\} + \bar{D} \nabla \partial \mathbf{w}] + \{\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\}^T \partial (\mathbf{F} - A\mathbf{w}) \\ \leq & C \|D(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) - \bar{D}\|_\infty \|\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\|^2 + C \|(\nabla D)(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}})\|_\infty \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \|\partial \mathbf{w}\| \|\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\| \\ & + C \|(\partial D)(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}})\|_\infty \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^4}^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \|\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\| \\ & + C \|(\partial \mathbf{F})(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}})\|_\infty \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\| \|\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\| + C \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{w} + \bar{\mathbf{W}}) - A\|_\infty \|\partial \mathbf{w}\| \|\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\|. \end{aligned}$$

We apply the following the Sobolev imbedding to control $\|w\|_\infty$

$$(3.2) \quad \|g\|_{L^\infty(2\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C_0 \|g\|_{H^2(2\mathbb{T}^d)},$$

for $d \leq 3$. Moreover, from the periodic boundary conditions,

$$\int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla u = \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla v = 0,$$

we also use the Poincare inequality

$$(3.3) \quad \|g\| \leq \|g\|_{L^4(2\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C_0 \|\nabla g\| \quad \text{if } d \leq 3.$$

to further get

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq C_0 \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{H^2} \leq C_0 \sum_{|\partial|=2} \|\partial \nabla \mathbf{w}\|.$$

where C_0 is a universal constant. From (2.2) and the assumption $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^2} \leq \eta$, the last nonlinear term in (3.1) is bounded by

$$C_0 C_\eta (1 + \eta) \|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \partial \mathbf{w}\|^2.$$

We now estimate the second quadratic term in (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \{ \bar{D}_1 |\nabla \partial u|^2 + \bar{D}_2 |\nabla \partial v|^2 \} + \bar{g}_v \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial v|^2 \\ & + (\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u) \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \partial u \partial v + \bar{f}_u \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u) \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \partial u \partial v + \bar{f}_u \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial u|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{|\bar{g}_v|}{2} \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial v|^2 + \left\{ \frac{(\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u)^2}{2|\bar{g}_v|} + \bar{f}_u \right\} \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can bound the linear term in (3.1) by ($\bar{g}_v < 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \{ \bar{D}_1 |\nabla \partial u|^2 + \bar{D}_2 |\nabla \partial v|^2 \} - \frac{|\bar{g}_v|}{2} \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial v|^2 \\ & + \left\{ \frac{(\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u)^2}{2|\bar{g}_v|} + \bar{f}_u \right\} \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the interpolation between $\|\nabla \partial u\|$ and $\|u\|$, the last term above is bounded by

$$\left\{ \frac{(\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u)^2}{2|\bar{g}_v|} + \bar{f}_u \right\} \left\{ a \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \|\nabla \partial u\|^2 + \frac{1}{4a^2} \int_{2\mathbb{T}^d} \|u\|^2 \right\}$$

for any $a > 0$. We can choose a such that

$$\left\{ \frac{(\bar{f}_v + \bar{g}_u)^2}{2|\bar{g}_v|} + \bar{f}_u \right\} a = \frac{1}{2} \bar{D}_1.$$

Collecting terms, we conclude the proof. $\square$

We are now ready to establish the bootstrap lemma, which controls the H^2 growth of $\mathbf{w}(x, t)$ in term of its L^2 growth nonlinearly.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that $\mathbf{w}(x, t)$ is a solution to the full system (1.4)-(1.5) such that for $0 \leq t \leq T$*

$$\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, t)\|_{H^2} \leq \min \left\{ \eta, \frac{\bar{D}_1}{2C_0C_1}, \frac{\bar{D}_2}{C_0C_1} \right\}$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, t)\| \leq 2C_1 e^{\lambda_{\max} t} \|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, 0)\|,$$

then we have for $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$\|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C_3 \{ \|\mathbf{w}(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + e^{2\lambda_{\max} t} \|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, 0)\|^2 \}$$

where $C_3 = C_1^2 \max\{\frac{4C_2}{\lambda_{\max}}, 1\} \geq 1$.

Proof. It suffices to only consider the second-order derivatives of $\mathbf{w}(x, t)$. From the previous lemma and our assumption for $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^2}$, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{|\alpha|=2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \{|\partial u|^2 + |\partial v|^2\} d\mathbf{x} \leq C_2 \|u\|^2.$$

So that by (3.4) and an integration from 0 to $t \leq T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\partial|=2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \{|\partial u(t)|^2 + |\partial v(t)|^2\} \\ & \leq \sum_{|\partial|=2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \{|\partial u(0)|^2 + |\partial v(0)|^2\} + \frac{4C_2 C_1^2}{\lambda_{\max}} e^{2\lambda_{\max} t} \|\mathbf{w}(\cdot, 0)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus our lemma follows. $\square$

4. NONLINEAR INSTABILITY AND PATTERN FORMATION

We now prove our main Theorem 1:

Proof. Let $\mathbf{w}^\delta(x, t)$ be the family of solutions to the reaction-diffusion system (1.4)-(1.5) with initial data $\mathbf{w}^\delta(x, 0) = \delta \mathbf{w}_0$. Define T^* by

$$T^* = \sup \left\{ t \mid \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t) - \delta e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}_0\| \leq \frac{C_1}{2} \delta \exp(\lambda_{\max} t) \right\}.$$

Note that T^* is well defined. We also define

$$T^{**} = \sup \left\{ t \mid \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{H^2} \leq \min \left\{ \eta, \frac{\bar{D}_1}{2C_0 C_1}, \frac{\bar{D}_2}{C_0 C_1} \right\} \right\}.$$

We now derive estimates for H^2 norm of $\mathbf{w}^\delta(x, t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \min\{T^*, T^{**}\}$. First of all, by the definition of T^* , for $t \leq T^*$ and Lemma 1

$$\|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t)\| \leq \frac{3C_1}{2} \delta \exp(\lambda_{\max} t).$$

Moreover, using Lemma 4 and applying a bootstrap argument yields

$$(4.1) \quad \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t)\|_{H^2} \leq \sqrt{C_3} \{\delta \|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2} + \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} t}\}.$$

We now estimate the L^2 norm of $\mathbf{w}^\delta(x, t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \min\{T^*, T^{**}\}$. We apply Duhamel's principle to obtain

$$\mathbf{w}^\delta(t) = \delta e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}_0 - \int_0^t e^{\mathcal{L}(t-\tau)} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)) d\tau,$$

Using Lemma 1, (3.2), (3.3), and Lemma 4 yields, for $0 \leq t \leq \min\{T^*, T^{**}\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t) - \delta e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}_0\| \\
& \leq C_1 \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{\max}(t-\tau)} \|\{\nabla \cdot (D \nabla \mathbf{w}^\delta) - \bar{D} \nabla^2 \mathbf{w}^\delta\} + \mathbf{F} - A \mathbf{w}^\delta\| d\tau \\
& \leq C_1 \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{\max}(t-\tau)} \|D\|_{C^1} \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\|_\infty \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\|_{H^2} d\tau \\
& \quad + C_1 \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{\max}(t-\tau)} \|D\|_{C^1} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\|_{L^4} d\tau \\
& \quad + C_1 \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{\max}(t-\tau)} \|F\|_{C^2} \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\|_\infty \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\| d\tau \\
& \leq C_1 C_0^2 C_\eta \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{\max}(t-\tau)} \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(\tau)\|_{H^2}^2 d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

from assumption (2.2) with $\|w\|_{H^2} \leq \eta$. We plug (4.1) with $t = \tau$ to further obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.2) \quad & \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(t) - \delta e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}_0\| \\
& \leq C_1 C_0^2 C_\eta C_3 \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{\max}(t-\tau)} \{\delta^2 \|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \delta^2 e^{2\lambda_{\max}\tau}\} d\tau \\
& \leq C_1 C_0^2 C_\eta C_3 \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2}^2 \delta}{\lambda_{\max}} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max}t} \right\} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max}t}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now choose θ in T^δ in (2.1) to satisfy

$$(4.3) \quad C_0^2 C_3 C_\eta \theta < \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{4},$$

$$(4.4) \quad 2\sqrt{C_3} \theta < \min \left\{ \eta, \frac{\bar{D}_1}{2C_0 C_1}, \frac{\bar{D}_2}{C_0 C_1} \right\}.$$

We now prove by contradiction that for δ sufficiently small,

$$T^\delta \leq \min\{T^*, T^{**}\},$$

and therefore our theorem follows from (4.2), by further separating $\mathbf{q} \in \Omega_{\max}$ and move $\mathbf{q} \notin \Omega_{\max}$ in (1.18) to the right hand side.

If T^{**} is the smallest among T^δ , T^* and T^{**} , we can let $t = T^{**} < T^\delta$ in (4.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{w}^\delta(T^{**})\|_{H^2} & < \sqrt{C_3} \{\delta \|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2} + \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} T^\delta}\} \\
& = \sqrt{C_3} \{\delta \|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2} + \theta\} \leq 2\sqrt{C_3} \theta,
\end{aligned}$$

for small δ such that $\delta \|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2} \leq \theta$. By the choice of θ in (4.4), we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}(T^{**})\|_{H^2} < \min \left\{ \eta, \frac{\bar{D}_1}{2C_0C_1}, \frac{\bar{D}_2}{C_0C_1} \right\}.$$

This is a contradiction to the definition of T^{**} .

On the other hand, if T^* is the smallest among among T^δ , T^* and T^{**} , we can let $t = T^*$ in (4.2) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{w}^\delta(T^*) - \delta e^{\mathcal{L}t} \mathbf{w}_0\| \\ & \leq C_1 C_0^2 C_3 C_\eta \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2}^2 \delta}{\lambda_{\max}} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} T^\delta} \right\} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} T^*} \\ & \leq C_1 C_0^2 C_3 C_\eta \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2}^2 \delta}{\lambda_{\max}} + \frac{\theta}{\lambda_{\max}} \right\} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} T^*} \\ & < \frac{C_1}{2} \delta e^{\lambda_{\max} T^*}, \end{aligned}$$

for $C_0^2 C_3 C_\eta \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_0\|_{H^2}^2 \delta}{\lambda_{\max}} < 1/4$ for δ small, by our choice of θ in (4.3). This again contradicts the definition of T and our theorem follows. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Bardos, C; Y. Guo; W. Strauss: Stable and unstable ideal plane flows. Dedicated to the memory of Jacques-Lious Lions, Chinese Ann. Math. Ser B. 23 (2002), no 2, 149-164.
- [2] V. Castets, E. J. Boissonade, P. De Kepper, Experimental evidence for a sustained Turing-type nonequilibrium chemical pattern. Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990), 2953-2956.
- [3] R. Dillon, P. K. Maini, H. G. Othmer, Pattern formation in generalized Turing systems. I. Steady-state patterns in systems with mixed boundary conditions. J. Math. Biol. 32 (1994), no. 4, 345-393.
- [4] P. Grinrod, Patterns and Waves: The Theory and Applications of Reaction-Diffusion equations, Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- [5] Y. Guo: Instability of symmetric vortices with large charge and coupling constant. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 49 (1996) no. 8, 1051-1080.
- [6] Y. Guo, H.J. Hwang, Pattern formation (I): The Keller-Segel Model, preprint
- [7] Y. Guo, C. Hallstrom, and D. Sporn, Dynamics near an unstable Kirchhoff ellipse, Comm. Math. Phys. 245, (2004) 297-354.
- [8] Y. Guo, W. Strauss: Instability of periodic BGK equilibria. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 48 (1995) no. 3, 861-894.
- [9] H-J, Hwang; Y. Guo: On the dynamical Rayleigh-Taylor instability. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 167 (2003), no. 3, 235-253.
- [10] E. Keller, L. Segel, Initiation of Slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability, J. Theor. Biol. 26, (1970) 399-415.
- [11] L. Edelstein-Keshet, Mathematical models in biology, Birkhäuser Mathematics Series.

- [12] K.J. Lee, W.D. McCormick, J.E. Pearson, H.L. Swinney, Experimental observation of self-replication spots in a reaction-diffusion system. *Nature* 369 (1994), 215-218.
- [13] H. Meinhardt, *Models of biological pattern formation*, Academic press, London (1982).
- [14] J. Murray, *Mathematical Biology*, Springer-Berlag.
- [15] Q. Quyang, H. Swinney, Transition from a uniform state to hexagonal and striped Turing patterns. *Nature* 352 (1991), 610-612.
- [16] J.J. Tyson, Classification of instabilities in chemical reaction systems, *J. Chem. Phys.* 62 (1975), 1010
- [17] A. Turing, The chemical basis of morphogenesis, *Phil. Trans. Roc. Soc. B* 237 (1952), 37-72.
- [18] E. Sander, T. Wanner, Pattern formation in a nonlinear model for animal coats. *J. Diff. Eqs.* 191 (2003) 143-174.

DIVISION OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, RI 02912, USA

E-mail address: guoy@dam.brown.edu

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, DUBLIN 2, IRELAND

E-mail address: hjhwang@maths.tcd.ie